DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 460 EC 093 180

AUTHOR	McKnight-Taylor, Mary
TITLE	Summer Program for Hospitalized Handicapped Children, Summer 1975. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	B/E-09-61607
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*City Wide Programs; Elementary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Hospitalized Children; *Hospital Schools; Individualized Instruction; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Presented is an evaluation of a program designed to provide intensive reading instruction to individual hospitalized, handicapped children in New York City. The project is noted to have served 375 children in 22 hospital settings and involved 32 teachers. Reported are findings indicating that approximately 92% of the pupils mastered at least one objective which they did not master prior to the program, and that 53% of the pupils mastered at least 76% of the instructional objectives to which they were exposed after having demonstrated previous non-mastery. Among listed recommendations are that the program be refunded and the budget be increased. Appended materials include the CROFT reading test forms, sample evaluation forms, and data collection forms. (IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136460

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. B/E#09-61607

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR HOSPITALIZED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

SUMMER 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mary McKnight-Taylor, Ed.D.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer of 1975.

EC093180

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11301

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I
Description of Project and Population ..... Page 1

Chapter II
Evaluation Procedures ..... Page 2

Chapter III
Findings ..... Page 7

Chapter IV
Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions
and Recommendations ..... Page 19

Chapter V
Abstract of Program. ..... Page 21

Chapter VI
Appendices ..... Page 25

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Hospital Centers - Centers Visited by Evaluator	6
Table A	Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastery on Pretest and No Post-Test Follow Up	9
Table B	Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction	9
Table C	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objective as a Result of Instruction	11-14
Table D	Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction	10
Table E	Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	14

CHAPTER I: THE PROGRAM

Type of Program. This program was designed to provide instruction concentrating on the individual needs of physically handicapped children in hospital schools. It was an intensive remedial reading program. It was organized into small class units with emphasis on individualized instruction. The program was tailored to meet the academic retardation, physical handicaps and emotional stresses continually arising in the lives of the hospitalized children.

Purpose. The program was instituted in order to provide a structure that would prevent mental and physical stagnation and academic regression, particularly in the basic skill area of reading. The purpose of such intervention was to help students cope more successfully with the academic demands of their source schools during the next school year.

Population. The program was designed to serve approximately 330(*) handicapped children in 22 separate hospital settings. Children on all school levels who were confined to the participating hospitals were eligible for the program. The students were admitted on a voluntary basis,

---

(*) As always, the hospital stay of children in the program was indeterminate. Many children did not stay the full six weeks. As one child left, another, sometimes several others, would be admitted to class rolls. Thus the population figure of 330 was closely approximated for every day of the six-week program.

through referrals from doctors or nurses, or through teacher selection.

Length of Program. There were 28 teaching sessions scheduled. The program began on July 1, 1975 and ended on August 8, 1975. The school day was scheduled to begin at 8:30 and end at 12:00 Noon.

Program Objective. There was one program objective, namely: to help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading which they failed prior to instruction as measured by the CRCFT (Redding) criterion referenced test.

CHAPTER II: EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation Objectives. There were three evaluation objectives. They were:

1. To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70% of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master.
2. To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.
3. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Implementation of Objectives. Evaluation objectives #1 and #2 were implemented in the following ways:

Pretesting. There were several possibilities

for movement of pupils through the program:

1. Pretest - Non-Mastery - Instruction on CROFT objectives.
2. Pretest - Mastery - Retest (until non-mastery was encountered, then) Instruction on CROFT objectives.
3. Pretest - Non-Mastery (on a level below or above CROFT) - Instruction on other than CROFT objectives.

Selection of the instructional objectives were made by the teachers. This selection was based on information from several sources. The level for pretesting was sometimes based on information obtained from records of city-wide testing done in May, 1975 for Title I children. In other instances teachers used informal testing procedures such as oral reading from graded texts to ascertain error patterns and then selected appropriate instruction at levels from the CROFT. The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) was also used as a pre-placement diagnostic tool so that appropriate skill levels could be more logically established than was possible by simply equating the child's designated grade level with competence in those skills on the CROFT which were listed for the respective grades.

A diagnostic profile could be made for each child who functioned within the limits of the CROFT. The prescription for teaching was provided by the error patterns

recorded on the individual record cards provided by CROFT. (See Appendices A and B for both sides of the record form).

Instruction. The period of instruction, the type of instruction, (individual-classroom, individual-bedside, or small group) was determined by the teacher. This determination was made dependent on staffing, the physical and emotional condition of the pupil, and the type of activity in which they were to be involved.

Posttesting. A posttest on each objective on which the pupil received instruction followed instructional sessions. Posttesting was done for all pupils except for the 84 students listed in Table A (p.9) and for students who mastered objectives on entry. The latter received no instruction on the objectives mastered on entry and no posttests. (See Table B, p. 9)

Evaluation Objective #3. The success of the third evaluation objective was determined through field visits (personal observation and interview), collection of record forms and supporting data such as instructional plans, materials, and the dissemination and collection of an evaluation form which gave the teachers, paraprofessionals and teachers-in-charge an opportunity to evaluate the following aspects of the program:

1. Hospital facility and staff*

(*) Item 9 on actual evaluation form. See appendix C for sample form.

2. Communication between sites, centers and home office
3. Materials
    A. Testing (availability)
    B. Instructional
4. Format of program
    A. Strengths
    B. Weaknesses
    C. Test Instruments (strengths and weaknesses)

The number of visits and the sites to which visits were made by the evaluator are listed in Table 1. Activities in progress and those planned for were monitored using the Site Visit form devised by the writer. (See Appendix E). Many factors were considered in evaluating the manner in which the program was implemented. The types of exceptionalities, the educational prognosis for them, the hospital setting, and the type and quantity of materials were some of the variables that were recorded.

TABLE 1

Hospital Sites	Borough	# of Classrooms	# of Teachers	# of PP **
Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center	K	1	1	0
*Downstate Medical Center	K	1	1	0
*Kings County B(***)	K	1	2	1
*Kings County E(***)	K	2	3	1
Cumberland	K	1	1	1
*Institute of (***) Rehabilitation Medicine	M	2	2	1
I.C.D.Rehabilitation & Research Center	M	1	1	0
*Beth Israel (***)	M	1	1	1
*New Bellevue(***)	M	1	1	0
*University	M	1	1	0
Mt. Sinai	M	1	1	0
*Special Surgery	M	1	2	1
*Harlem	M	1	1	0
*Metropolitan	M	1	1	0
Presbyterian	M	1	1	0
*Lincoln	X	1	1	0
*Morrisania	X	1	1	0
*Bronx	X	1	1	0
*Jacobi	X	1	1	0
*Fordham	X	1	1	0
*St. Mary's (***)	Q	6	6	6
*Triboro (***)	Q	1	1	0
	Totals	29	32	12

*Sites visited
**Paraprofessionals
***Multiple visits

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

Program Objective. The program appeared to be successful in meeting its objective of helping pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading which they fail prior to instruction as measured by the CROFT (Reading) Criterion Referenced Test.

Evaluation Objective #1. This objective was: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master. This objective was met. This objective was achieved by 91.7 percent of the population. Mastery of one to two objectives was achieved by 65.4 percent of the students (N = 189). Three to four objectives were mastered by 17.0 percent of the students (N = 49). Mastery of more than four objectives was achieved by 9.3 percent of the students (N = 27). This data is outlined in Table D, page 10. Data loss, or depressed gains are attributable to the fact that mastery may have been entered without supportive information, or inappropriately entered as mastery for areas that required achievement of at least 75% and thus could not be counted. (The reader is reminded of the lack of differentiation by some teachers between mastery on entry and mastery after instruction).

Evaluation Objective #2. This objective was met on a high level of achievement, by 83 percent of the students recorded in Table E. This objective was: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives. A mastery level of 76 - 100

percent of the objectives attempted after instruction was reached by more than 50 percent of the population. There were 131 children (53.3%) who mastered objectives at this level. (See Table E for additional information.)

Evaluation Objective #3. This objective was: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal. This objective was evaluated using information gained in interview sessions with teachers and paraprofessionals, information from the program coordinator, materials gathered from the classrooms (submitted by the teachers) and from direct observation by the writer.

Deviations from the original design were minor. The deviations, however, highlight weak areas in the program design and suggest that careful attention be given to the remediation of the underlying problems which produced the differences between design and actuality.

TABLE A

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POST-TEST FOLLOW UP

Pre-Test Failure	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Total Population N=375
9-10		
7-8		
5-6		
3-4	2	.005
1-2	82	22.000
Totals	84	22.005

TABLE B

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY (*) OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
76-100%	265	71.00
51-75%	26	7.00
26-50%		
0-25%		

(*) Achievement of 75% was considered as mastery for this program

TABLE C (see following pages)

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

TABLE D

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
None	24	8.3
1-2	189	65.4
3-4	49	17.0
5-6	15	5.2
7-8	5	1.7
9-10 etc.	7	2.4
	289	

TABLE C

*DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objectives	Ratio of # pupils achieving mastery / pupils attempting mastery	No. of Pupils	Percentage of Mastery
**2-4-13	12/16	0	0-25
		1	26-50
		3	51-75
		12	76-100
2-2-1	3/3	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		0	51-75
		3	76-100
2-2-2	9/9	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		0	51-75
		9	76-100
2-2-4	5/19	1	0-25
		6	26-50
		7	51-75
		5	76-100
2-2-5	7/7	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		1	51-75
		6	76-100

*Each objective has scoring possibilities from 0-100. See Appendices A and B for CROFT record cards showing objectives and levels of mastery.

**Centers with pupils above and below the scope of CROFT used materials and tests of their own choice. Those students are not recorded here.

TABLE C (continued)

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objective	Ratio of # pupils achieving mastery / pupils attempting mastery	No. of pupils	Percentage of Mastery
2-1-1	12/22	6	0-25
		3	26-50
		3	51-75
		10	76-100
2-1-2	16/18	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		3	51-75
		15	76-100
2-1-4	17/25	0	0-25
		3	26-50
		12	51-75
		10	76-100
2-1-5	5/5	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		0	51-75
		5	76-100
2-1-6	18/24	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		6	51-75
		18	76-100
2-1-9	10/14	3	0-25
		0	26-50
		1	51-75
		10	76-100

TABLE C (continued)

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objective	Ratio of # Pupils achieving mastery / Pupils attempting mastery	No. of Pupils	Percentage of Mastery
2-4-1	2/8	0	0-25
		3	26-50
		4	51-75
		1	76-100
2-4-2	3/4	0	0-25
		1	26-50
		1	51-75
		2	76-100
2-4-3	1/2	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		1	51-75
		1	76-100
2-4-4	7/10	0	0-25
		4	26-50
		1	51-75
		5	76-100
2-4-6	12/23	1	0-25
		3	26-50
		13	51-75
		6	76-100
2-4-7	0/2	0	0-25
		0	26-50
		2	51-75
		0	76-100

TABLE C (continued)

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objectives	Ratio of # Pupils achieving mastery / Pupils attempting mastery	No.of Pupils	Percentage of Mastery
		0	0-25
2-4-8	9/24	5	26-50
		11	51-75
		8	76-100
2-4-9	7/10	0	0-25
		1	26-50
		4	51-75
		5	76-100

Total number of pupils 245

TABLE E

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES (*)

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
0-25	11	4.5
26-50	30	12.2
51-75	73	30.0
76-100	131*	53.3
	245	

*Total plus 20 students passing on objectives 2-4-13 (special objectives)

Timing of Instructional Sessions. The program was in operation from July 1st to August 12th with instructional sessions of 3½ hours, beginning on July 2nd and ending on August 8th. There was some descrepancy between the number of days planned for testing and instruction and the number that were actually available. Orientation sessions July 1st and July 7th and collection of test materials and records on August 4th and 5th, reduced the amount of data available, though there was sufficient supportive data to measure all objectives. The time for instruction was sometimes reduced by pupil absence due to visits to or by medical specialty units. Short term admissions or early discharges further reduced the amount of testing, instruction and re-testing that was possible.

Record Keeping. Differentiations between non-mastery because of insufficient instruction, non-mastery after instruction, and unexpected exits because of medical discharge were not uniformly made. Hence, reasons for no post-tests cannot be stated unequivocally. The information in Tables A and B then must be interpreted with the knowledge that the information from which they were drawn was not oomplete. Two factors may account for gaps in the test records: lack of familiarity with the instrument, and delay in acquisition of testing procedures, manuals and materials.

Records on the length of stay and time devoted to instruction per pupil were not uniformly kept. Statistics on these aspects of the program were recorded for some

centers by the evaluator personally or supplied by teachers. Variations in the time for the school day existed, as well as the length of the school day. Early morning arrivals by some teachers paralleled the breakfast, bathing, dressing hospital routine. Teachers in some facilities used this time to visit the wards to check for new admissions or discharges affecting their registers. Some teachers on evaluation visits stayed as late as 1:30 at their own insistence, seeking clarification of procedures.

Instructional Content. The major focus of the instructional sessions was on reading. A variety of materials was used. Films and filmstrips were used to motivate the children to read. Puzzles, reading games and language stimulation activities were used. At least an hour and a half of reading or reading related experiences were engaged in by most students at each session. This included intensive individual instruction, independent review, and small group activities. Change of pace activities included music, arts, crafts and discussions. Mathematics instruction was geared toward furthering reading skills. This included problem solving activities and practice in reading number words.

Materials. The late arrival of testing materials and uncertainty about testing procedures reduced the amount of testing and re-testing that could have been done. The quantity and quality of instructional materials varied from site to site. Some centers were well-stocked with children's literature as well as instructional texts. Others were less

adequately provided for either because the available material was beyond the level of the population or the teacher felt uncomfortable using "winter stock" belonging to another teacher without permission. One center in the Bronx was the recipient of special funds for supplies from the staff of the host hospital. Another teacher was able to secure materials, including xeroxing privileges from her winter job and thus could function more adequately in that center.

Evaluation Returns. There were 33 responses to the EVALUATION OF SUMMER PROGRAM FORM. Responses to sections of the form varied. Not everyone responded to every section. See Appendix C for the form to which the following responses were made.

Communication. There were numerous breakdowns in communication which resulted in a fairly dangerous isolation of teachers from program goals, proper procedure, and supportive services, even by telephone. The telephone system in some hospitals was chronically out of order. In other cases, because of bedside visits, or distribution of pupils on several floors, teachers were often not accessible by phone. However, most of the personnel (81.8%) who responded to the 1975 evaluation form rated communication good to satisfactory (N=27) for communication with the office and project sites and centers. Five persons (15%) rated communication as fair. Rating of classroom location, equipment and materials by project staff was good. Twenty-four persons

(70.5%) rated location good, six (18%) satisfactory and three (9%) as unsatisfactory. Equipment and materials were rated by 58% (N=20) as good, 20% (N=7) as ample and 9% (N=3) as insufficient.

Program Goals. The format of the program was rated as to strengths and weaknesses as was the test instrument (CROFT). Program goals were not always interpreted accurately by hospital staff and the classroom was seen as a supplement or an alternative to the recreation room. Arrival of students was another problem area. In some instances students did not arrive for instruction in the classroom before 9:15, 9:30. Physical therapy, occupational therapy, medication schedules, tests and visits by the doctor, further diminished the time for instruction.

Of the 27 persons responding to this section of the evaluation form, 23 rated the emphasis on reading, the diagnostic facets, individualization of instruction and the specificity of problem areas (via the CROFT) as strengths (85%). The amount of record keeping required by this program and the short span of the program were cited as weaknesses by 20 persons (74%). The other responses cited short supply of materials necessitating xeroxing, and the amount of time spent in testing as opposed to teaching time, as weaknesses.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The program objective appears to have been achieved in that the evaluation objectives were met. Evaluation objective #1 was met by 91.7 percent of the population. Evaluation objective #2 was met at a high level also. Fifty-three percent of the children mastered objectives on a level of at least 76 percent.

The quality of the staff was high and their involvement was exemplary. They worked with a good sense of responsibility but were frustrated by:

1. lack of knowledge of proper testing procedures,
2. insufficient and delayed dissemination of materials,
3. rapid entry and exit of pupils.

Recommendations. This program responds to the need for continuity of education for hospitalized children whose chronic conditions necessitate lengthy hospital stays. It is less responsive to the needs of acute problems since severe illness and rapid recovery (and discharge) preclude intensive or sustained instruction. The diagnostic component answers a real need for specificity of attack on academic problems. The lack of follow-up was unfortunate. The following recommendations are being made on the basis of observation of the program and additional data collected in the role of evaluator. It is recommended that:

1. The program be re-funded.
2. The program be re-written to include pre-program

orientation, introduction to materials, and training in their use.

3. Teachers keep, and submit for analysis, records which include length of time on rolls and number of sessions of instruction.

4. The records of diagnostic and instructional work done in the program be forwarded to the pupils' parents and to their home schools.

5. The budget be increased to include instructional materials for centers.

6. Criterion Referenced materials continue to be utilized as diagnostic tools.

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

Title I

B/E #09-61607

Summer, 1975

This program was designed to provide intensive reading instruction to individual hospitalized, handicapped children. The instructional strategies were adopted to answer the needs of children who were academically retarded, physically handicapped, or emotionally maladjusted. The diagnostic and remedial work was to be geared toward the prevention of mental and physical stagnation, and academic regression, particularly in the area of reading.

B/E project #09-61607 served 375* children in 22 hospital settings. There were 29 classrooms with 32 teachers. The classrooms were located in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens. Twelve paraprofessionals were assigned to the program. Of the twelve assigned, nine were observed during site visits. Three student teachers and several volunteers increased the staff in at least three centers. The program began on July 1, 1975 and ended on August 12, 1975.

The CROFT (Reading) Criterion Reference Test was used as the official diagnostic and evaluation instrument. The evaluation objectives were met. Approximately 92 percent of the pupils mastered at least one objective which prior to the program they did not master. Fifty three percent of the pupils mastered at least 76 percent of the instructional objectives to which they were exposed after having demonstrated previous non mastery.

---

* A hospitalized population is subject to frequent departures. As children left, others replaced them. The population count approximated 330 for each day of the program.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

(22)

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION III

1974-75 School Year

Due Date: July 15, 1975

SED Project Number | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 5 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | S | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only) | 0 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 |

Project Title Summer Program for Hospitalized Handicapped Children (1975)

School District Name 75 - Special Schools (DSEPPS)

School District Address 110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Mary McKnight-Taylor, Ed.D.

Title Project Evaluator

Telephone Number 516 (Area Code) 486-3110

Date this form was completed Nov. / 15 / 1975

32. Program Abstract: Please provide an abstract of your project, including aspects of the project which account for highly positive results. Provide a summary of the findings in relation to the objectives, as well as a description of the pedagogical methodology employed.

33. Date activities began 7 / 1 / 75 (Mo. Day Yr.) Date activities will terminate 8 / 12 / 75 (Mo. Day Yr.)

34. Project time span (check one): 1|☐| School Year 2|☒| Summer 3|☐| 12 Mos. 4|☐| More than 1 year

35. Project is: 1|☐| New 2|☒| Resubmitted 3|☐| Continuation (Title III only)

A. If project is resubmitted, please indicate number of years operated:

|☐| 2 years |☐| 4 years

|☐| 3 years |☒| 5 or more years

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2101	Letter Recognition	Croft Educ Services	P	60861	H	Insuff. Data*	22	12	10
2102.5	Consonants	"	"	"	"	"	18	16	2
2102.4.5	Consonant Blends Group A	"	"	"	"	"	39	31	8
2106.7	Vowels	"	"	"	"	"	47	31	16
2105,8	Consonant Blends Group B	"	"	"	"	"	18	14	4
2201	Compound Words	"	"	"	"	"	3	3	0
2202	Contractions	"	"	"	"	"	9	9	0
2204	Prefixes & Suffixes	"	"	"	"	"	19	4	15
2205	Syllables	"	"	"	"	"	7	7	0
2404	Facts & Details	"	"	"	"	"	26	13	13
2406	Main Ideas	"	1	"	"	"	23	12	11
2408	Drawing Conclusions	"	1	"	"	"	24	9	15
2403	Inferences, Cause & Effect	"	1	"	"	"	10	7	3
	TOTALS						265	168	97

29

29

28

***Recording procedures varied. Only positive failures could be reliably ascertained.**

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.

2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A: CROFT - Individual Record Card - Diagnostic Reading Comprehension Test..... 25 and 25 A

APPENDIX B: CROFT - Individual Record Card - Diagnostic Word - Analysis Test..... 26 and 26 A

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE FORM - Evaluation of Summer Program..... 27

APPENDIX D: DATA Collection Form..... 29

APPENDIX E: Site Visit Record Form..... 30

APPENDIX F: DATA Collection Form - Lesson Plans..... 32

Individual Record Card

APPENDIX A:

the McGuire-Bumpus

diagnostic reading comprehension test

Name _____

Date of Birth 1-25-66

Pattern Identification
cl - classification
sq - sequence
cs - causation
cp - comparison

Paragraph Reading Objectives

Level P Pretest	Level P Mastery		Level P	Level I Pretest	Level I Mastery	Level I
		A-1: The learner will recognize and select the detail taken directly from the paragraph that best completes a sentence. (Test A, Item 1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		A-2: The learner will select a translation of a detail from the paragraph that best completes the sentence. (Test A, Item 2)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
	5-24-75	A-3: The learner will recognize and select the signal words relating to the paragraph pattern. (Test A, Item 3)	cl cs sq cp cl cp cs sq cp cl cs sq			cl cs sq cp cl cp cs sq cp cl cs sq
		A-4: The learner will select the one response that best expresses the main idea of the paragraph. (Test A, Item 4)	cl cs sq cp cl cp cs sq cp cl cs sq			cl cs sq cp cl cp cs sq cp cl cs sq
		B-1: The learner will complete a sentence by selecting a detail that is implied by the information given. (Test B, Item 1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		B-2: The learner will select a statement that tells the relationship among the ideas in the paragraph. (Test B, Item 2)	cp sq sq cs cp cl cp cs cl cs sq cl			cp sq sq cs cp cl cp cs cl cs sq cl
		B-3: The learner will select the main idea that may be inferred from information in the paragraph. (Test B, Item 3)	cp sq sq cs cp cl cp cs cl cs sq cl			cp sq sq cs cp cl cp cs cl cs sq cl
		C-1: The learner will analyze a paragraph and select the question (main idea) that best states the problem. (Test C, Item 1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		C-2: The learner will select the hypothesis that best fits the situation. (Test C, Item 2)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		C-3: The learner will distinguish between relevant and irrelevant details and select whichever is called for. (Test C, Item 3)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		D-1: The learner will select the criterion that is the most appropriate basis for making a judgment. (Test D, Item 1)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
		D-2: The learner will select a judgment based on the criterion. (Test D, Item 2)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

• croft educational services • 1973

(25A)

Name _____

Date of Birth _____

Individual Record Card

the McGuire-Bumpus

diagnostic reading comprehension observation checklist

Date Pretest	Date Mastery	Readiness Objectives
		GOAL A: ORAL LANGUAGE READINESS
		OLR-1 Given an appropriate object or situation, the learner will talk about it in one or more simple sentences. Concrete Level.
		OLR-2 Given an appropriate graphic illustration of things and events within his experience, the learner will talk about it in one or more simple sentences. Semi-abstract Level.
		OLR-3 Given an appropriate oral stimulus, the learner will talk in one or more simple sentences about past or anticipated experiences related to it. Abstract Level.
		GOAL B: WRITTEN LANGUAGE READINESS
		WLR-1 Given an appropriate object or situation, the learner will dictate in two or three simple sentences an experience story about what he is currently doing. He will "read" it back from memory with more than half the words correct. Concrete Level.
		WLR-2 Given an appropriate graphic illustration of things and events within his experience, the learner will dictate an experience story about it in two or three simple sentences. He will "read" it back from memory with more than half the words correct. Semi-abstract Level.
		WLR-3a Given an appropriate oral stimulus, the learner will dictate in two or three simple sentences an experience story about a past or anticipated experience. He will "read" it back from memory with more than half the words correct.
		WLR-3b Given the mastery of the preceding objectives and practice in recognizing words taken from the stories, the learner will recognize at sight a minimum of 10 words. Abstract Level.
		GOALS C, D, E, F: PATTERN READINESS
		PR-1 Given an appropriate choice of several familiar objects, the learner will choose three that belong to the same class (based on a selected characteristic such as color, size, shape, texture, weight, nature, function, etc.), label them (call them by name), and tell why they belong together. Concrete Level.

Date Pretest	Date Mastery	
		PR-2 Given an appropriate choice of illustrations of several familiar objects or events, the learner will choose three that belong to the same class (based on a recognizable characteristic), label them, and tell why they belong together. Semi-abstract Level.
		PR-3 Given four dictated words, three of which belong to the same class, the learner will select the three that belong together and tell why they do. Abstract Level.
		PR-4 Given an appropriate group of objects, the learner will seriate them by size, shades of color, texture, etc. Concrete Level.
		PR-5 Given three appropriate pictures, the learner will sequence them and tell the story they depict. Semi-abstract Level.
		PR-6 Given three simple oral directions, the learner will follow them in sequence. Abstract Level.
		PR-7 Given an appropriate situation for discussion, the learner will give plausible reasons why an event is occurring or predict its possible outcomes. Concrete Level.
		PR-8 Given an appropriate picture, the learner will explain what is occurring and give plausible reasons for it or describe possible outcomes of the event depicted.
		PR-9 Given an oral story containing instances of the cause-effect pattern, the learner will relate why something happened or will describe the effects of certain actions. Abstract Level.
		PR-10 Given three objects, two of which are alike, the learner will choose the two that are alike and tell how the other one is different. Concrete Level.
		PR-11 Given pictures of three objects, two of which are alike, the learner will indicate the two that are alike and tell how the other one is different. Semi-abstract Level.
		PR-12 Given the names of two objects familiar to him, the learner will tell how they are alike or different. Abstract Level.

(26)

APPENDIX B:

Name _____

Date of Birth _____

Individual Record Card

APPENDIX B

the COOPER-McGUIRE
diagnostic word-analysis test

READINESS OBJECTIVES

Date Pretest	Date Mastery		
		Goal A R 1: Given groups of four letters, the learner will be able to select and mark the letter he hears dictated by the teacher with 80% accuracy. (Test R 1)	m s b e r f t p d n h a w l g o k v u i j y q x z c
		R 2: The learner will be able to write the letters of the alphabet in scrambled order, as dictated by the teacher, with 80% accuracy. (Test R 2)	a c m s b e r f t p d n j h w i l g o k v u y q x z
		Goal B R 3: Given four pictures whose names begin with three different sounds, the learner will be able to mark the two beginning with the same sound as two dictated words with 80% accuracy. (Test R 3)	% 7 13 20 27 33 40 47 53 60 67 73 80 87 93 100
		R 4: When the teacher says the separate sound elements of a word, the learner will be able to blend them and say the word with 80% accuracy. (Test R 4)	% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
34		Goal C R 5: Given four choices, the learner will be able to mark the word that is the same as the first word with 80% accuracy. (Test R 5)	% 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100

PHONICS OBJECTIVES (Consonants)

		Goal A P 1: The learner will be able to recognize the consonant corresponding to the sound he hears at the beginning of two dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 1)	m s b r f t p c(k) d n w c(s) h l k g(j) v y j z g
		P 2: The learner will be able to recall the sound of a given consonant and match it to a picture beginning with the same sound with 100% accuracy. (Test P 2)	m c(k) n s p d b g f t r k y h w g(j) v z j l c(s)

Date Pretest	Date Mastery		
		P 3: The learner will be able to make new words by substituting initial consonants in known, dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 3)	f r m d b p c(k) n g s t j y l w h k c(s) v g(j) z
		P 4: The learner will be able to use the context plus the initial consonant sound to figure out unknown words with 80% accuracy. (Test P 4)	% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		P 5: The learner will be able to recognize the consonant corresponding to the sound he hears at the end of two dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 5)	b g t d m n p r f s l(le) k ve ge ce z x
		P 6: The learner will be able to indicate whether a given consonant sound is heard at the beginning, middle, or end of a dictated word with 80% accuracy. (Test P 6)	% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		P 7: The learner will be able to recognize the consonant blend or digraph he hears at the beginning of two dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 7)	1: sh ch wh th th bl sp br s: cl dr cr fl fr gl tr pl gr sl pr 2: sm qu thr sn tw squ str sw sk spl sc spr scr shr
		P 8: The learner will be able to make new words by substituting initial consonant blends and digraphs in known dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 8)	cl th sw spr tr wh gr sk pl bl pr sp sn st br qu dr shr tw fr scr str ch sl spl cr sm thr squ sc gl sh fl th
		P 9: The learner will be able to recognize the consonant blend or digraph he hears at the end of two dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 9)	sh st th ft nd nk nt ng pt lk tch gh sp dge sk lt ld ch lf nch ck mp

85

Date
Pretest Mastery

PHONICS OBJECTIVES (Vowels)

		Goal B P 10: The learner will be able to recognize and write the vowel he hears in a dictated word with 100% accuracy. (Test P 10)	o i e a a u e u u e i o e a o i u o i a
		P 11: The learner will be able to differentiate between the long and short vowel sounds when they are presented in dictated words with 100% accuracy. (Test P 11)	i a u e a i o e o u
		P 12: The learner will be able to identify the vowel heard in a dictated word and record whether its sound is long, short, or *r*-controlled with 100% accuracy (Test P 12)	i u a ar e e i er a or o ir o ur u
		P 13: The learner will be able to identify the letters representing the vowel digraph or diphthong he hears when these sounds are dictated with 100% accuracy. (Test P 13)	o͞o aw ai ea ow oi ou oa ee ow o͝o eu ay au ew oy
		P 14: The learner will be able to indicate the vowels he hears in dictated words of one or more syllables with 80% accuracy. (Test P 14)	% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		P 15: Given statements of the most common vowel principles, the learner will be able to indicate which one applies to a given word with 100% accuracy. (Test P 15)	Principles 5 3 2 4 1 4 1 5 3 2
		P 16: Given a list of nonsense words, the learner will be able to mark the vowels to indicate whether they are long, short, *r*-controlled, or unsounded with 100% accuracy. (Test P 16)	Principles 4 5 2 3 1 2 1 4 3 5
		P 17: Given a list of nonsense words, the learner will be able to pronounce them according to the letter sounds and vowel principles that have been taught with 100% accuracy. (Test P 17)	% 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OBJECTIVES

		Goal A S 1: The learner will be able to identify the simple endings that denote tense (ed, ing), number (s, es), person (s, es), possession ('s), and comparison (er, est) when inflected forms of words are dictated with 100% accuracy. (Test S 1)	ed(d) ed(ed) s est ing es er en ed(t) s

Date
Pretest Mastery

		S 2: The learner will be able to identify the root word in an inflected form (having an ending) or in a derived form (having a prefix or suffix) with 100% accuracy. (Test S 2)	1	% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
			2	% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		Goal B S 3: Given a compound work, the learner will be able to divide it into its component parts with 80% accuracy. (Test S 3)		% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		S 4: The learner will be able to write the two words for which a contraction stands with 100% accuracy. (Test S 4)		% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		S 5: The learner will be able to identify prefixes and suffixes in a list of derivatives with 100% accuracy. (Test S 5)		y in non ness dis ful un ex ment ward able ly pre less sub re mis ish anti ist
		S 6: Given a list of prefixes and suffixes, the learner will be able to identify the affix to be added to a given root word to make sense in a sentence with 100% accuracy. (Test S 6)		% 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
		Goal D S 7: The learner will be able to indicate the number of syllables heard in a dictated word by counting the vowel sounds with 100% accuracy. (TEST S 7)		% 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100
		S 8: The learner will be able to apply vowel principles to syllables and indicate whether the vowel sound in a syllable is long, short, or *r*-controlled with 100% accuracy (Test S 8)		Principles 1 5 2 1 3 2 3 5
		S 9: Given a list of two-syllable nonsense words, the learner will be able to divide them into syllables according to the principles of syllabication with 100% accuracy. (Test S 9)		Principles 2 1 3 6 4 5 1 3 2 5 6 4
		S 10: Given a list of two-syllable nonsense words, the learner will be able to pronounce them, making application of vowel sounds and principles to syllables with 100% accuracy. (Test S 10)		% 8 17 25 33 42 50 58 67 75 83 92 100

©CROFT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC., 1972

___Paraprofessional ___Teacher ___Teacher In Charge

EVALUATION OF SUMMER PROGRAM

Summer, 1975 Evaluator: Dr. Mary McKnight-Taylor

STAFF STATISTICS

1. Educational Level

__High School __2 yrs of college ___4 yrs college

__Masters __Other (2 Master's, credits above Master's, etc.)

2. Number of years (teaching, assisting) in regular education.

___

3. ____ Number of years (teaching, assisting) in special education.

4. ____ Number of Summers in this program.

5. ___(yes) ___(no) Special training in testing. (If yes, please indicate: _____college courses ___Board of Educ. Seminars _____other.

6. ___(yes) ___(no) Special training in teaching reading. (If yes, please indicate: _____college courses _____reading specialist

7. ____Percent of time spent during the regular school year on reading or reading related activities.

8. Your areas of strength:

____ diagnostic

____ remedial procedures

____ knowledge of materials

____ creativity in producing materials

____ knowledge of language other than English:

I ____ speak ____ understand ____ write

_____ Yiddish, _____ Italian,

_____ Spanish, _____ Other,

APPENDIX C

HOSPITAL FACILITY AND STAFF

9. Classroom

(a) Location: _____ good _____ satisfactory

_____ unsatisfactory

(b) Equipment and materials: _____ good _____ ample

_____ insufficient

10. Communication between sites, centers and home office

_____ good _____ fair _____ poor

(Cite examples)

11. Materials

(a) Testing: _____ available in sufficient quantity

_____ not available in sufficient quantity

_____ available with delay

(b) Instructional:

_____ limited range _____ wide range

_____ insufficient quantity _____ sufficient quantity

_____ made my own _____ bought new materials

_____ borrowed from winter stock

12. FORMAT OF PROGRAM

Strengths

Weaknesses

Testing Instruments - Strengths and Weaknesses (Please use other side)

DATA COLLECTION FORM

PROJECT: B/E # 09-61607 Evaluator: Dr. Mary McKnight-Taylor

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR HOSPITALIZED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Please keep records which will supply the following information:

1. Entry Level ..... Objective(s) Number and category
2. Characteristics of pupils:
   - a. Physical condition
   - b. Mental level
   - c. Energy level (scale of 1 to 5)
   - d. Attention span (scale of 1 to 5)
   - e. Special problems
3. Time spent in reading or reading-related activities:
   - a. Objective
   - b. Textbooks (Science, Basal, etc.)
   - c. Language Arts
4. Type of instruction group:
   - a. Small
   - b. Individual
   - c. Bedside
   - d. Independent work
5. Instructor:
   - a. Teacher
   - b. Para-professional
   - c. Volunteer
6. Materials (*)

   Names

   Manufacturers or publishers

   Skills which it develops, etc.

(*) Teacher Made

S I T E V I S I T S

Dr. Mary McKnight-Taylor Date_____

Number of students _____ Time _____

_____ # teachers

_____ # volunteers

_____ # paraprofessionals

ACTIVITIES OBSERVED

_____ Teaching of Reading

Skill(s) _____

_____

_____

_____ Teaching of Math

_____ Ward visits

_____ Escorting children

_____ Conferences with nurses

_____ Arts and crafts

_____ Monitoring of class activities

_____ Puzzles, games, etc.

_____ Filmstrips

_____ Listening activities (____records _____ stories)

_____ Testing

_____ Pre _____ Post

Yes No Interaction with Hospital Staff

_____ Nurse

_____ Doctor

_____ Other

Groupings

_____ classroom _____ Individual with teacher

_____ Individual with Paraprofessional

_____ Independent _____ Bedside

Types of Exceptionalities

_____ Orthopedic problems _____ C.P. _____ wheelchair

_____ Restricted upper extremities _____ other

COMMENTS

General impression of effectiveness of program as observed.

Program goals being met? To what extent?

Special problems as cited by staff:

Problems noted by evaluator:

APPENDIX E (cont.)

APPENDIX F

DATA COLLECTION FORM

PROJECT: B/E #09-61607 SUMMER PROGRAM FOR HOSPITALIZED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1975

Evaluator: Dr. Mary McKnight-Taylor

WHO	#6 GIVEN WHAT MATERIALS	#3 DOES WHAT ACTIVITY	#5 WITH WHOM	% ACCURACY	HOW WELL TIME SPENT